

LITIGATION ROSTER

SPECIAL TAXES

FEBRUARY 2014

Special Taxes
FEBRUARY 2014

NEW CASES

Case Name

Court/Case Number

NONE

CLOSED CASES

Case Name

Court/Case Number

NONE

Please refer to the case roster for more detail regarding new and closed cases

Special Taxes
LITIGATION ROSTER
FEBRUARY 2014

BRAR & CHAHAL INC. v. CA State Board of Equalization

Fresno County Superior Court Case No. 11CECG02688 DJK

Filed – 08/04/11

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Clark L. Rountree

Attorney at Law

BOE's Counsel

Steven J. Green

BOE Attorney

Wendy Vierra

Issue(s): The issue in this case is whether or not tobacco products were seized illegally under the authority of [Business & Professions Code section 22974 and 22974.3](#).

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unspecified

Status: On August 8, 2011, the judge denied Petitioner's ExParte Application for Stay of the Suspension of License to Sell Tobacco. Plaintiff also filed a Petition for Preliminary Writ of Mandate but has not served BOE. Awaiting proper service.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION I, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

California Supreme Court Case No. S150518

Filed – 04/13/04

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 04CS00473

Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District Case No. C050289

Plaintiffs' Counsel

David A. Battaglia, Alan N. Bick

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The California Supreme Court issued its decision on FEBRUARY 31, 2011, affirming the Court of Appeal's judgment holding that the fee statutes at issue are facially constitutional and reversing the Court of Appeal's determination that the statutes and their implementing regulations are unconstitutional as applied. The case is remanded to the Court of Appeal to remand to the trial court for proceedings consistent with the opinion. Petitions for Rehearing filed. On April 20, 2011, the Court denied the petitions for rehearing, and modified its opinion. Remittitur issued May 12, 2011. At the Status Conference on July 29, 2011, the judge ordered discovery in the Water Rights cases. As instructed by the Court at the July 29, 2011, case management conference, on September 30, 2011, the Attorney General's Office filed its Initial Joint Stipulation outlining the parties' briefing schedule. At the Status Conference on October 21, 2011, the judge granted BOE's motion to transfer the Palo Verde case to Sacramento, set a further case management conference for January 13, 2012, and set the case for a two-week trial on July 16, 2012. A Substitution of Attorney was

filed for Petitioner City of Fresno on November 10, 2011. A Notice of Entry of Dismissal was entered for Petitioner Stone Corral Irrigation District on November 17, 2011. Trial was held from December 4, 2012 through December 19, 2012. The court scheduled post-trial briefing. On May 15, 2013, Defendant filed its Notice of Lodging for ERRATA to Administrative Record. On June 12, 2013, Defendant filed its stipulation to present specific exhibits to the court and to correct specific exhibits, and its order. On June 20, 2013, Defendant filed its notice of entry of order to present specific exhibits to the court. On July 1, 2013, Petitioners filed their reply brief. Respondents State Water Resources Control Board, et al., filed their post trial response brief on July 1, 2013. On September 6, 2013, Sacramento Superior Court issued its tentative decision in favor of Plaintiffs ruling that the fees imposed by the Water Resources Control Board are invalid, because the statutory fee scheme and implementing regulations do not provide a fair, reasonable and substantially proportionate assessment of all costs related to the regulation of affected payors. On October 23, 2013, the Department of Justice filed a response on behalf of the Defendants, opposing Petitioners' submission regarding remedies. On October 30, 2013, the court heard argument concerning its tentative decision. The Court issued its Final Statement of Decision on November 12, 2013, confirming that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid. The Court further ruled that the fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. The Court has not yet issued its final judgment in this matter. On December 13, 2013, the Trial Court issued its final judgment in favor of the Plaintiffs. The Court determined that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid, and further ruled that fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On February 10, 2014, Respondents filed a Notice of Appeal to the trial court's water rights decision. On February 21, 2014, Plaintiff, California Farm Bureau Federation filed Opposition to Respondent's motion to tax costs. Northern California Water Association filed an Opposition to motion to tax costs on the same date. On February 27, 2014, Respondents filed their reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to motion to tax costs.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION II, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 05CS00538

Filed – 01/13/05

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Plaintiffs' Counsel

David A. Battaglia

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2004-2005

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION III, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 06CS00651

Filed – 04/26/06

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Plaintiffs' Counsel

David A. Battaglia

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2005-2006

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION IV, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 07CS00485

Filed – 02/11/08

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Plaintiffs' Counsel

David A. Battaglia, Alan N. Bick

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2006-2007; 2007-2008

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION V, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2009-80000231

Filed – 05/07/09

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Plaintiffs' Counsel

David A. Battaglia, Alan N. Bick

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2009-2009

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, Case No. S150518.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION VI, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2011-80000880

Filed – 06/10/11

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Nancy McDonough

Attorney at Law

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2009-2010, 2010-2011

Amount: Unspecified

Status: On July 1, 2011, Plaintiff dismissed Jerome E. Horton as Chairperson of the Board of Equalization. This case is stayed pending the outcome of the stipulation pending the outcome of the consolidated cases – see Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

CALIFORNIA INSURANCE COMPANY v. California State Board of Equalization

Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC530993

Filed –12/19/13

Plaintiff's Counsel

Spencer Y. Kook

James C. Castle

Barger & Wolen LLP

BOE's Counsel

Kathleen Lynch

BOE Attorney

Wendy Vierra

Issue(s): Plaintiff, a property and casualty insurance company licensed to do business in California, contends that it is entitled to a refund of taxes paid on premiums received for certain policies issued during the period of January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2005. Plaintiff contends that said premiums were not received as a result of business done in California within the meaning of Revenue and Taxation Code section 12221 since the policies were issued to a professional employer organization in Idaho and the premiums were received in Idaho.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: \$962,453.80

Status: On December 23, 2013, Plaintiffs filed service of summons and complaint and related documents on the BOE. A case management conference is scheduled for March 19, 2014. On February 4, 2014, BOE filed its answer to the complaint for refund.

GREYHOUND LINES, INC. v. California Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 07CS00054

Filed – 01/12/07

Plaintiff's Counsel

William D. Taylor, Eli R. Makus

Hanson, Bridgett, Marcus, Vlahos & Rudy, LLP

BOE's Counsel

Bob Asperger

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether consumption of diesel fuel used to operate air conditioning systems on buses was exempt from the diesel fuel tax ([Revenue and Taxation Code section 60501\(a\)\(4\)\(A\)](#); [Regulation 1432](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 08/01/01-12/31/03; 01/01/04-06/30/05

Amount: \$295,583.04

Status: BOE's Answer to the Second Amended Complaint was filed February 1, 2010. On March 5, 2010, Greyhound agreed to remove its Demurrer to BOE's Answer to the Second Amended Complaint from the court's March 19, 2010 calendar. On September 23, 2011, Plaintiff Greyhound and

Defendant BOE stipulated and agreed that the action against the defendant going to trial within five years of the date the action commenced, as stated in the code of [Civil Procedure section 583.310](#), would be extended for 24 months.

HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSN., et al. v. CA Dept. of Forestry, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court: 34-2012-00133197-CU-MC-GDS

Plaintiff's Counsel

Trevor A. Grimm

Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Foundation

Filed – 10/04/2012

BOE's Counsel

Linda Berg Gandara

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): The issue in this case is whether the Fire Prevention Fee enacted by [AB X1 29 \(Stats 2011, First Ex. Sess. Ch.8\)](#) is a tax and, as such, not enacted without receiving the two-thirds vote required by [article XIII A, section 3, of the California Constitution](#).

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unspecified

Status: BOE's response was due and filed on April 26, 2013. At the July 19, 2013 hearing, the court issued a ruling on the submitted matters: 1) the Court overruled CalFire's demurrer to the first amended complaint for failure to state sufficient facts to allege class action causes for relief; 2) the Court ruled in CalFire's favor that Plaintiffs should have filed a petition for redetermination before filing a claim for refund; and 3) CalFire's motion to strike certain paragraphs of plaintiffs' first amended complaint were granted. Plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint on July 29, 2013. BOE's response to Plaintiff's second amended complaint was filed on August 7, 2013. On November 21, 2013, a hearing was held on the Demurrer, and the matter was taken under submission. On December 13, 2013, the Court issued a ruling agreeing with CalFire on CalFire's demurrer to Plaintiffs' second amended complaint. On January 21, 2014, attorneys for Plaintiffs filed opposition to Calfire's proposed order on the demurrer and motion to strike Plaintiffs' second amended complaint. On January 24, 2014, attorneys for Defendant filed notice of order on Calfire's demurrer and motion to strike regarding Plaintiff's second amended complaint. On January 24, 2014, attorneys for Plaintiffs filed "Class Action" third amended complaint for declaratory relief and refunds. On February 25, 2014, CalFire filed an answer to Plaintiffs' third amended complaint. On February 28, 2014, BOE filed an answer to Plaintiffs' third amended complaint.

MYERS, MICHAEL D.

Los Angeles County Superior Court: BS143436

Plaintiff's Counsel

Richard J. Ayoob

Ajalat, Polley, Ayoob & Matarese

Filed – 7/3/2013

BOE's Counsel

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): The primary dispute in this matter is between the plaintiffs and Blue Cross/Blue Shield. BOE is a nominal defendant.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unspecified

Status: On September 5, 2013, BOE filed its Notice of Appearance. The September 25, 2013 Status Conference has been continued to October 22, 2013. The Initial Status Conference set for

October 22, 2013, was continued to February 3, 2014. The Court permitted BOE to file a no-position response on November 22, 2013. On December 20, 2013, notice of change of address was filed by Attorneys for Real Party in Interest. On December 23, 2013, Plaintiffs filed a request for judicial notice (in support of Plaintiffs oppositions to RPI's demurrers to petition and complaint). On December 23, 2013 Plaintiffs filed their objection to real party in interest, California Physicians' Service dba Blue Shield of California and RPI Blue Cross' request for judicial notice in support of demurrer to petition and complaint. Plaintiffs filed points and authorities in opposition to real party in interest Blue Cross of California dba Anthem Blue Cross' demurrer to petition and complaint on December 23, 2013,. Plaintiffs also filed points and authorities in opposition to real party in interest California Physicians' Service dba Blue Shield of California's demurrer to petition and complaint. On January 17, 2014, attorneys for real party in interest, Blue Cross of California dba Anthem Blue Cross filed its reply in support of demurrer. On the same date, attorneys for real party in interest filed its response to Plaintiff's objection to Blue Cross' request for judicial notice.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION I, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

California Superior Court Case No. S150518

Filed – 12/17/03

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776

Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District: 03CS01776

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly

Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The California Supreme Court issued its decision on January 31, 2011, affirming the Court of Appeal's judgment holding that the fee statutes at issue are facially constitutional and reversing the Court of Appeal's determination that the statutes and their implementing regulations are unconstitutional as applied. The case is remanded to the Court of Appeal to remand to the trial court for proceedings consistent with the opinion. Petitions for Rehearing filed. On April 20, 2011, the Court denied the petitions for rehearing, and modified its opinion. Remittitur issued May 12, 2011. At the Status Conference on July 29, 2011, the judge ordered discovery in the Water Rights cases. As instructed by the Court at the July 29, 2011, case management conference, on September 30, 2011, the Attorney General's Office filed its Initial Joint Stipulation outlining the parties' briefing schedule. A Status Conference is scheduled for October 21, 2011. A Substitution of Attorney was filed for Petitioner City of Fresno on November 10, 2011. A Notice of Entry of Dismissal was entered for Petitioner Stone Corral Irrigation District on November 17, 2011. Trial was held from December 4, 2012 through December 19, 2012. The court scheduled post-trial briefing. On May 15, 2013, Defendant filed its Notice of Lodging for ERRATA to Administrative Record. On June 12, 2013, Defendant filed its stipulation to present specific exhibits to the court and to correct specific exhibits, and its order. On June 20, 2013, Defendant filed its notice of entry of order to present specific exhibits to the court. On July 1, 2013, Petitioners filed their reply brief. Respondents State Water Resources Control Board, et al., filed their post trial response brief on July 1, 2013. On September 6, 2013, Sacramento Superior Court issued its tentative decision in favor of Plaintiffs ruling that the fees imposed by the Water Resources Control Board are invalid, because the statutory

fee scheme and implementing regulations do not provide a fair, reasonable and substantially proportionate assessment of all costs related to the regulation of affected payors. On October 23, 2013, the Department of Justice filed a response on behalf of the Defendants, opposing Petitioners' submission regarding remedies. On October 30, 2013, the court heard argument concerning its tentative decision. The Court issued its Final Statement of Decision on November 12, 2013, confirming that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid. The Court further ruled that the fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. The Court has not yet issued its final judgment in this matter. On December 13, 2013, the Trial Court issued its final judgment in favor of the Plaintiffs. The Court determined that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid, and further ruled that fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On February 10, 2014, Respondents filed a Notice of Appeal to the trial court's water rights decision. On February 21, 2014, Plaintiff, California Farm Bureau Federation filed Opposition to Respondent's motion to tax costs. Northern California Water Association filed an Opposition to motion to tax costs on the same date. On February 27, 2014, Respondents filed their reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to motion to tax costs.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION II, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 04CS01467

Filed – 10/29/04

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2004-2005

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION III, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 05CS01488

Filed – 10/19/05

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2005-2006

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION IV, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 06CS01517

Filed – 10/18/06

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2006-2007

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION V, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2008-00003004-CU-WM-GDS

Filed – 02/07/08

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2007-2008

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION VI, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2009-80000183

Filed – 03/05/09

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2008-2009

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION VII, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.
Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2010-80000461

Filed – 03/04/2010

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2009-2010

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION VIII, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.
Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2011- 80000828

Filed – 04/05/2011

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2010-2011

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

PALO VERDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.
Riverside Superior Court Case No. INC 043178

Filed – 05/28/04

Plaintiff's Counsel

David R. Saunders
Clayson, Mann, Yaeger & Hansen

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530; 1535-1541; 1550-1552; and 1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases (see *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.) On September 8, 2011, the Attorney General's Office filed a Case Management Statement advising the Palo Verde Court that related SWRCB water rights cases were calendared for a Case Management Conference on October 21, 2011, in Sacramento. At the Case Management Conference, the judge in Sacramento granted BOE's motion to transfer this case to Sacramento to be heard, but not consolidated, with the other water rights cases. Trial was held from December 4, 2012 through December 19, 2012. The court scheduled post-trial briefing. On May 15, 2013, Defendant filed its Notice of Lodging for ERRATA to Administrative Record. On June 12, 2013, Defendant filed its stipulation to present specific exhibits to the court and to correct specific exhibits, and its order. On June 20, 2013, Defendant filed its notice of entry of order to present specific exhibits to the court. On July 1, 2013, Petitioners filed their reply brief. Respondents State Water Resources Control Board, et al., filed their post trial response brief on July 1, 2013. On September 6, 2013, Sacramento Superior Court issued its tentative decision in favor of Plaintiffs ruling that the fees imposed by the Water Resources Control Board are invalid, because the statutory fee scheme and implementing regulations do not provide a fair, reasonable and substantially proportionate assessment of all costs related to the regulation of affected payors. On October 23, 2013, the Department of Justice filed a response on behalf of the Defendants, opposing Petitioners' submission regarding remedies. On October 30, 2013, the court heard argument concerning its tentative decision. The Court issued its Final Statement of Decision on November 12, 2013, confirming that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid. The Court further ruled that the fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. The Court has not yet issued its final judgment in this matter. On December 13, 2013, the Trial Court issued its final judgment in favor of the Plaintiffs. The Court determined that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid, and further ruled that fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On February 10, 2014, Respondents filed a Notice of Appeal to the trial court's water rights decision. On February 21, 2014, Plaintiff, California Farm Bureau Federation filed Opposition to Respondent's motion to tax costs. Northern California Water Association filed an Opposition to motion to tax costs on the same date. On February 27, 2014, Respondents filed their reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to motion to tax costs.

STARBUZZ INC.

Orange County Superior Court: Case No. M-15069

Plaintiff's Counsel

David E. Swanson

Law Offices of David E. Swanson

Filed – 3/25/2013

BOE's Counsel

Lisa Chao

BOE Attorney

W. Gregory Day

Issue(s): Petitioner contends that its property was illegally seized pursuant to a search warrant by the Anaheim Police Department and other State agencies, which prevents petitioner from conducting its business, including the filing of tax returns. Petitioner contends that a special master must be appointed to determine whether any of the documents seized are protected by the attorney-client privilege and must be returned to petitioner.

Audit/Tax Period: Unknown

Amount: Not Specified

Status: The matter is pending appointment of a special master. At the October 18, 2013 hearing, the Court

denied Starbuzz's application for a protective order. The case will be held open for 30 days in the event of an appellate filing. On January 22, 2014, the Court appointed Laurie Schiff to act as Special Master to review records and computer files seized under search warrant for which a claim of attorney client communications privilege had been made. The Special Master is to review the records and computer files to determine whether any of the records and files are subject to the privilege, for the purpose of preserving the privilege.

TAKI, WAHID AHMAD dba News & Cigarettes City v. California Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2012-80001335

Filed – 12/14/12

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Caitlin Colman
Attorney at Law

BOE's Counsel

Jane O'Donnell

BOE Attorney

Sharon Brady Silva

Issue(s): The issue in this case is whether the evidence supports BOE's findings of petitioner's violation of [Bus. & Prof. Code section 22974 and 22974.3, subdivision \(b\)](#), which imposes a 10-day cigarette license suspension.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unknown

Status: BOE will file a timely response.

WATSON, RANDALL v. California Revenue and Taxation Code §20 Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2013-80001717

Filed – 1/21/14

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Plaintiff in Pro Per

BOE's Counsel

Robert E. Asperger

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter/John Waid

Issue(s): On December 23, 2013, Petitioner filed an Ex Parte Petition For Alternative Writ of Mandamus against BOE with respect to the Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention fire fee assessed against Petitioner (FF STF 63-030452). BOE issued Notice of Determination dated August 22, 2012, for the period July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012. Petitioner contends that BOE's assessment is invalid because the Notice of Determination was not signed by an assessor and it is not certified.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unknown

Status: On January 31, 2014, the hearing for Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Petition for alternate writ of mandamus was scheduled for February 7, 2014. On February 20, 2014, BOE filed its answer to petition for alternative writ of mandamus. A hearing on the merits is set for August 22, 2014.

ZARTOSHT INC. v. California Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2011-00106888

Filed – 07/15/11

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Scott Souers
Attorney at Law

BOE's Counsel

Steven J. Green

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): The issue in this case is whether or not tobacco products were seized illegally under the authority of Business & Professions Code section 22974 ([Bus. & Prof. Code section 22974](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: \$788.42

Status: The Court has notified the Plaintiff that their Proofs of Service are incomplete and the Court will not file their documents. On August 26, 2011, the BOE filed a Motion to Reclassify the case as one of unlimited jurisdiction. The BOE also filed a Motion to Strike plaintiff's demand for a jury trial and its request for damages. At the September 29, 2011 hearing, the court granted both of BOE's motions, and ordered the plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint to be filed and served on or before October 11, 2011. The case has not been set for further proceedings at this time. Plaintiff filed its First Amended Complaint (Unlimited) Against Defendants for 1) Release or Recovery of Property That Was Erroneously or Illegally Seized on November 4, 2011. BOE filed its General Denial on December 1, 2011. A date for the Status Conference has not yet been set.

**SPECIAL TAXES
CLOSED CASES
LITIGATION ROSTER
FEBRUARY 2014**

NONE

DISCLAIMER

Every attempt has been made to ensure the information contained herein is valid and accurate at the time of publication. However, the tax laws are complex and subject to change. If there is a conflict between the law and the information found, decisions will be made based on the law.

Links to information on sites not maintained by the Board of Equalization are provided only as a public service. The Board is not responsible for the content and accuracy of the information on those sites.